

Nothing about the housing at the blade end
In the Claims

Please cancel remaining claims 12, 14 and 15 and add new claims 16 and 17 below. These amendments are made to further clarify the invention in response to the Examiner's comments as set forth in the Office Action.

New Claims

16. A utility knife comprising:

a two-part housing wherein the two parts are first and second juxtaposed halves, the housing having a top and a bottom, with each half having a blade end and a back end, which blade end and back end form a front and a back of the housing, respectively, wherein the longitudinal axis of the housing extends from the front to the back;

a blade removably engaged within the housing and extending outward from the front, the blade having a cutting edge extending outward along the bottom of the housing;

first and second juxtaposed hooks in the blade ends of the first and second halves respectively wherein each hook forms an opening extending from the bottom of the housing toward the top, each opening being defined by a first side, a second side and an apex, wherein the openings and the sides are in substantially parallel alignment to the end of the housing from which the blade extends.

17. The utility knife of claim 16, wherein the blade is retractable.

Remarks

Pending claims 12, 14 and 15 have been canceled, and new claims 16 and 17 are added by way of this Amendment. Applicant has amended the specification and claims to further emphasize the parallel orientation of the hooks to the blade end which feature permits a tape measure to be held in close and substantially parallel alignment to the surface to be cut. Support for these amendments is found throughout the Specification, most particularly on p 4, 1st - 4th paragraphs, p. 7, 5th paragraph, and as in the amendment to p. 7, 5th paragraph. This feature is also present in Figures 1 and 2. No new matter is added by way of these amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicant has cancelled claim 12, rendering this basis for rejection moot. Applicant thanks the Examiner for her courtesy in correctly assuming claim 12 was intended to be dependent on claim 14.